

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner found that claims 4-12, 16-24, and 28-36 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including the requirements of the base and intervening claims and rejected claims 1-3, 13-15, and 25-27 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over prior art. The Examiner further rejected claims 25-36 as directed to non-statutory subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101).

Applicants amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to include the requirements of allowable claims 4, 16, and 28 to place these claims in condition for allowance. Claims 4, 16, and 28 are canceled.

Applicants amended claims 5-8, 17-20, and 29-32 to depend from amended claims 1, 13, and 25.

Applicants amended allowable claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35, and 36 to include the requirements of the base claims to place these claims in condition for allowance.

Applicants amended claims 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, and 31 to change “primary controller” to “first controller” and/or “secondary controller” to “second controller” because first controller and second controller are the correct names for this element.

Applicants amended claims 13 and 24 to remove the limitation numbering.

In amending claims 23 and 24 into independent claims, Applicants added the first and second storages as separate limitations to provide the antecedent basis.

In amending claims 35 and 36 into independent claims, Applicants added the first and second storages to the preamble to provide the antecedent basis.

### 1. The Amended Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 25-36 as directed to non-patentable subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101) on the grounds that the article of manufacture claims may cover transmission medium, such as signals.

On January 16, 2006, the attorney had a phone interview with Primary Examiner Bryce Bonzo and discussed amendments to the claims to overcome this rejection. Applicants amended claim 25 as discussed during the interview to recite a “computer readable medium including code executed by a processor”. The Specification discloses a computer readable medium including code executed by a processor at pg. 7, lines 18-23.

Applicants amended dependent claims 26-36 to change the language of the preamble from “article of manufacture” to “computer readable medium”.

Applicants submit that this amendment overcomes the rejection and such rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-27, and 29-36 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the claim amendments. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 17, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor  
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984